

STATEWIDE VOTER FILE SUBGROUP
VOTE INDIANA TEAM
March 14, 2003

Subgroup members present: Linda Grass, Laura Herzog, Brad King, Zach Main, Regina Moore, Martha Padish, Todd Rokita and Robin Winston. Facilitator: Sarah Taylor

Other Vote Indiana Team member present: Pam Finlayson

Other present: Sherry Beck, LaDonna Freeman and Barbara Fowler (Marion County Board of Voter Registration), Natalie Phillips Christl (Attain, Inc.), Steve Corey (Diebold E/S Inc.), Chris Horne and Bill McCully (Quest Information Systems)

No additions or corrections to meeting notes from February 28, 2003. The following materials were distributed to members: Pete Miller email dated March 12, 2003, Count Us In packet and news release on Vote Indiana Team.

Today's agenda was scheduled to include discussion on Statewide Voter File bullet points 1, 2, 6 and 9 from the Task Lists for Subgroups document.

Brad King opened the discussion under bullet point 1 by providing his thoughts in writing. Brad suggests that we expand the current use of the already established Indiana Voting Systems Improvement Fund to accept Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) monies. He also thinks as a matter of policy that the Secretary of State should administer the fund. The Budget Agency would have a limited role during contract review. All members stressed the need of involvement of the Indiana Election Division (IED) Co-directors in the vendor selection and systems development phases. It was also pointed out that participation by different sized counties' election officials would help balance the needs of all. **Consensus was reached on bullet point 1 that the Secretary of State administers the HAVA monies in the already established Voting Systems Improvement Fund. The role of the Budget Agency would be limited to contract review.**

Under bullet point 2, Brad handed out the Constitution Project document, Election Reform Briefing on Statewide Voter Registration Databases from March 2002. Brad emphasized the ongoing costs associated with maintaining a statewide voter file. According to this paper, 10 states have unified databases. He suggests that the local election officials must be able to add, delete or make corrections to the statewide voter file. It was again mentioned that follow up discussions and visits should occur to help position our state to learn from others. Michigan and Minnesota are states we should consider visiting their statewide voter file operations. The Election Assistance Commission (EAC) is to issue guidelines in October of 2003. Our state needs to prepare for the Request for Proposal stages including review, vendor demonstrations and selection. Time will need to be allotted for testing, piloting and training of the county

users. Brad also stressed the need for a secure system, helpdesk, and appropriate time for data conversion.

Laura Herzog pointed to the Pete Miller email suggesting an open system by which counties hook into the statewide voter file. Brad stressed his belief that a single statewide voter file is required under HAVA. The General Accounting Office (GAO) will conduct audits for compliant purposes. Laura said members of the Indiana Voter Registration Association (IVRA) would naturally resist one system because they like their individual systems. **Laura was asked to bring IVRA's latest survey on what systems are currently being used to the next meeting.** Brad stressed that the new system will need to offer what they already are capable of doing in their local offices in addition to other "bells and whistles." Regina Moore and Linda Grass both cited examples of how difficult conversion can be for offices. Zach Main suggested we benchmark up against the 10 states from the Constitution Project document. It was discussed that local representatives must help with the procurement process including the evaluation process to get buy in. Robin Winston mentioned that bids through the Indiana Department of Administration include a review panel that should include local practitioners.

To avoid "reinventing the wheel," it was decided that **members should forward questions for the unified database states to Sarah Taylor before the next meeting. Sarah will work with Brad to develop a survey for those states.** Suggestions for the survey included ongoing maintenance costs, vendor selection process, name of vendor, cost of system and whether it is Internet based or wide area based.

Bullet point 6 pertaining to the distribution and monitoring of HAVA funds was discussed next. Since it appears there will be no grants for the statewide voter file, this question may not be relevant. However, it is expected that the State Board of Accounts and the GAO will audit the statewide voter file funds.

The agenda for the next meeting on March 21, 2003 will be to discuss bullet point 9 pertaining to the maintenance of effort at the county level. A review of survey questions is scheduled. Bullet points 10 (unique ID numbers), 11 (replacing current procedures) and 12 (coordination with other agencies) will also be on the next agenda.

Public Comment: Natalie Christl (Attain, Inc.) suggests incorporating other agencies as full service voter registration sites while transitioning to meet HAVA requirements. Brad suggested this would be a change to NVRA and Indiana statute. Natalie thought incorporating other agencies would help bolster list maintenance and keeps costs down.

Sherry Beck (Marion County Board of Voter Registration) cited New York as an example of a state going with an open system. Sherry loves the NTS software system she has in place. It allows for document imaging, bar coding and petition menus. Currently, Marion County has a hiring freeze. Sherry currently leases her equipment. She has done more with less staff on her current system. She would not want to implement a system that would be more labor intensive for the largest Indiana County.

